



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a printed or spoken criticism on work of his is true, and how far it is true; to see if his brother-artist has done better than he, and wherein, and whether he can gain anything by study of this brother-artist's work. The more easily and completely he can judge himself and others in this way, the better for his art and for the world.

If these conditions be fulfilled by the artist and by the public, the production of good, if not of great, works of art will be assured.

ART. II. — *Climatology of the United States.* By LORIN BLODGET. Philadelphia. 1857. 8vo.

THE consideration of the question, "What caused the Secession of the South?" important as it was, during the prosecution of the war, in determining the policy of the Administration, is of still greater importance, now that the war is ended, in its bearings upon the problem of reconstruction. For it is sufficiently obvious that a correct solution of this problem, such a solution as will secure us from a repetition of the Southern Rebellion, by removing or neutralizing the influences which gave it birth, is only possible on the condition of a thorough comprehension of the nature of those influences. In the discussion to which this well-appreciated necessity has given rise, many theories have been educed both at home and abroad, and each has had its earnest supporters; and yet all of these theories seem doubly defective, either as the basis of a scheme of reconstruction or as the foundation of hopes for the future. First, in that they assign secondary causes, while behind them lies something which explains their own presence, and which, having produced them in the past, will probably exert a like effect in the future. Second, in that a great class of potent influences are totally neglected, namely, those effects of geographical situation which may be embraced in the term "climatic influences." The power of these influences in diversifying men and nations is now generally acknowledged; and when we consider the variety of climate in the United States, — greater,

perhaps, than that existing in any other nation of ancient or modern times, — the disregard of this element in the discussion of the causes of Secession appears to be one of the most remarkable facts in the history of political philosophy. The attempt will be made in this paper to show that climatic influences have not only affected the mental and moral character of the people of the South in a manner hostile to the Union, but have also generated those secondary causes commonly assigned as explanatory of Secession. The bearings of these truths upon the future stability of the Union, and consequently upon the question of reconstruction, will then be considered.

In the discussion of this question, we desire in the first place to show the secondary nature and consequent incompleteness of the causes commonly assigned as accounting for the dissimilarity between the North and South which resulted in Secession.

Chief among these is slavery. This “sum of all villanies,” as Wesley aptly called it, breeds or aggravates so many social evils, that it is by no means wonderful that it should be considered the cause of all the phenomena which preceded and brought on Secession ; and yet, in assigning it as the cause of Secession, for the purposes of history or statesmanship, the double defect of which we have spoken is strikingly manifest.

First, since it fails to account for its own presence. All the original Northern States held slaves, but one by one abolished “the institution,” while the Southern States retained it. Here is a dissimilarity back of slavery which itself needs explanation. No one will suppose, for an instant, that the superior piety or humanity of the North accounts for this. There must have been some influences at work here which may powerfully affect the future, as they have affected the past. The influences so potent in retaining slavery, against the opinions of the civilized world, may be such as will tend to revive it, though under another name and form.

And secondly, slavery alone cannot account for the devotion of the South to free trade, for the prominence and power of the doctrine of State rights, or for the growth of a virtual aristocracy, all of which facts exerted a great influence upon Secession.

If any of these facts is assigned as the cause of Secession, its own origin still remains unaccounted for, while, moreover, any one of them is an insufficient explanation of that which we seek to account for. As regards free trade, the strength of this principle in the South arose from her almost exclusive devotion to agriculture, the North encouraging a diversity of pursuits. Here is a dissimilarity which needs explanation, and one which has always existed, as well while the Northern States held slaves, as since the passage of their emancipation laws. During the seventeenth century repeated attempts were made to establish manufactures in Virginia, but they signally failed, while proving successful in Massachusetts. The question, Why were manufactures never established in the South, as in the North? requires solution. That the devotion of the South to free trade was not alone sufficient to produce Secession has been so often and ably shown, that nothing need be added.

Again, taking the doctrine of State rights, the question arises, Why was this more powerful at the South than at the North? Or, taking the aristocracy of the South as the cause of Secession, a theory which perhaps would number more adherents than any other, the question remains, Why was there an aristocratic power at the South, and not at the North? For some years it has been the fashion in certain Southern circles to attribute this diversity to "inherent natural differences," the South claiming a superior aristocratic origin. This "vulgar mode of accounting for the diversities of conduct and character," as John Stuart Mill calls it, is rapidly falling into disuse, even when based upon correct data. But in this case all the early history of the country confirms Hildreth when he says: "Both in Virginia and New England, the difference between 'gentlemen' and 'those of the common sort' was very palpable."* Colonial annals show that the aristocracy was as marked in Massachusetts as in the "Old Dominion"; while in New York was seen in the patroons, the proprietors of the manors, the wealthiest and most powerful aristocracy in the Colonies. So the question arises here, as in the other cases, Why has the aristocracy died out in the North, and strengthened in

* History of the United States, Vol. I. p. 509.

the South? It can hardly be because of slavery; for the decline in the North and the growth in the South of aristocratic feelings were as marked and rapid while the Northern Colonies held slaves, as at any time since the abolition of slavery.

We apprehend that the only answer to these questions, and consequently the only complete explanation of the diversities between the North and South which resulted in Secession, is to be found in the diversity of the soil and climate of the Northern and Southern States.

And first as to slavery. In the North is a barren, sterile soil, compared with the rich, exuberant lands of the South. In the North it is a work of some difficulty to obtain the necessities of life; hence no drones can be allowed, every man's labor must be of a valuable kind. Slave labor was not profitable here; it did not return the expense of feeding, clothing, and warming; while in the South less food, less clothing, and scarcely any fuel are required, and food is obtained at comparatively little cost. Where expenses are so slight, even the poor labor of the slave is profitable, or at least certainly was so in early times, when slaves were cheap. To the superior fertility of the soil, in itself partially the result of warmth of temperature, the more direct effect of a kindly climate must also be added. This in the South permits the cultivation of staples forbidden by Nature to the colder North, — tobacco in early Colonial times, afterwards rice, sugar, and cotton. These latter require large tracts of ground, and can be produced by unskilled labor, but need it in large quantities. Hence a double reason explains the firm establishment and retention of slavery in the South; and the same reasons account for the marked preponderance of indentured white servants during Colonial times.

In addition to this influence, the effect of the climate upon intellectual and religious education, to be noticed hereafter, would render the South less susceptible to the moral arguments which undoubtedly had some share in the abolition of slavery at the North.

Secondly, as to the diverse pursuits of the sections. Why were not manufactures established in the South, as well as in the North? Not, as some persons would have us believe, because, needing skilled labor, the white mechanic would not

work by the side of the slave. As we have remarked before, this error is exposed by the fact that manufactures were established in the North nearly two centuries before the abolition of slavery.

But in New England, where manufactures succeeded, while they failed in Virginia, the soil gave but a bare subsistence, leaving nothing for luxury, and affording little for exportation as payment for foreign manufactured goods. The natural resort was to a home production of those articles which they could not afford to purchase abroad; and consequently we see from the earliest days the manufacture of linen, cotton, and woollen clothes, iron, &c. But in the South just the reverse was seen. During the early Colonial times the great staple was tobacco, which the planters were obliged to send to England for sale. And the proceeds of this tobacco purchased the articles of dress which the New England Colonist was compelled to manufacture.* For this reason manufactures were not established in the Southern Colonies. No class of society needed them to supply the necessaries or comforts of life; and in such a state of affairs, they never have been, and probably never will be, successful. The causes which prevented their establishment at a later day, when the population had increased, and the lands become exhausted, will be spoken of hereafter.

The same influences which made New England manufacturing also made her commercial, and nurtured her fisheries; while the want of incentives to these branches of industry in the South were, of course, the same which prevented manufactures. We have said nothing of England's colonial policy as an element in these questions; for, as it was about the same in each case, it does not affect the argument.

We have thus shown that the retention of slavery, and the exclusive devotion of the South to agriculture, were the results of her geographical situation. We now desire to show how this exclusive devotion to agriculture, together with the direct effect of the warm climate upon individuals, fostered the aristocracy of the South. Regarding the influence of slavery, we need add little to the immense amount already written and

* See this commented on in Jefferson's Notes, Query 19.

spoken upon this subject. We only design to show that some of the phenomena usually attributed to slavery have no connection with it; while other phenomena which it has affected would probably have reached the same result without its influence, although after a longer period of time. An example of the first has already been given in the failure of the Southern Colonies to establish manufactures; and an example of the latter is the aristocracy of the South.

It has been often remarked by writers upon political philosophy, that the country wholly devoted to agriculture necessarily tends to aristocracy, despotism, or some form of enslavement of the masses. Mr. H. E. Carey devotes nearly the whole of his work on "Social Science" to supporting and illustrating this proposition. Montesquieu, in "The Spirit of Laws," notices this tendency, supporting himself by a quotation from Cicero.* Buckle devotes some sixty pages of his "History of Civilization" to showing the truth of this statement, as applied to countries lying in warm latitudes, like the Southern States.† Other authorities will be cited farther on.

But, viewing the subject in the light of reason rather than of authority, and employing as convenient tests the conditions which Webster, in his speech at Plymouth, and after him De Tocqueville,‡ assign as the causes of the maintenance of democratic institutions in this country,—namely, universal education, religious training, and the general division of landed property,—the manner in which the exclusive devotion of the South to agriculture, and the more direct effects of the warmth of her climate, cause her tendency to aristocracy, will be sufficiently obvious.

From the large plantations required by her great staples arose a necessary dispersion of population,—that scattered settlement, and absence of small towns, which strike a Northerner so forcibly in travelling through any Southern State. And, in fact, in a purely agricultural country, whatever the staple may be, there can be but few towns, since these are in modern times generally the result of manufacturing or commercial activity. Most of the large and many small towns of the North are

* Book XVIII. Chap. 1.

† Vol. I. Chap. 2.

‡ Democracy in America, Vol. I. Chap. 17.

formed around such centres. The influence of these aggregations of men upon their progress in civilization is a matter of common historical observation.*

And the importance of their absence from the South can hardly be exaggerated. It prevented the general establishment of newspapers, of the lecture-room, that great educator, and, to an extent, of the town-meetings and frequent political assemblages which are made so powerful as educational agents in the North. In a country so sparsely settled, and so devoid of small towns as intellectual centres, a general common-school system, or, in fact, any general educational system, is impossible. And the difference in this respect between the North and South was as marked in Colonial times as now. Berkeley, a Colonial Governor of Virginia, writing home to England, thanked God that there were no free schools in his Colony, as in the North.

And, again, the fact of the exuberance of the soil is hostile to any general intellectual activity. The labor of a few months gives the small proprietor food for the year; and, like all men without the stimulus of want, his months of freedom from necessary toil are spent in idleness, with its consequent unfitness for labor during the next season, thus leading to ignorance, dissipation, — in short, the degradation of the poor whites. It is with nations as with individuals; the heirship of great riches is seldom conducive to general mental development.

And we should add to these two still another consideration, — the direct effects of the warmth of climate upon individuals. This is opposed as well to intellectual as to bodily activity, and would prevent those energetic struggles for the acquisition of knowledge which are seen so often among the agricultural people of the North.

Considering these influences, we need not attribute a great weight to slavery in causing such a condition of education as all the Southern States exhibit. For example, in Virginia, in 1848, there were 166,000 youths between the ages of seven and sixteen years; of these, 126,000 attended no schools, and received no education.†

* *Wealth of Nations*, Book III. Chap. 4. Notes and Illustrations to Robertson's Charles the Fifth.

† Cited from Harrison's *History of Virginia*, by F. L. Olmsted, "Seaboard Slave States," p. 173.

Moreover, this sparseness of population, absence of small towns, richness of soil, and warmth of climate also prevent the religious education so important as the supporter of democratic ideas. The reports of colporteurs, travelling among the "poor whites," read like missionary letters from India or Africa. One writes: "Visited sixty families; forty-one destitute of the Bible; average of their going to church, once in seven years. Some grown-up youths had never heard a prayer or sermon before mine."

Such books as those of Kirke and Olmsted give a sad picture of the religious and moral degradation of these people. This religious ignorance cannot be wholly ascribed to slavery; for certainly ministers enough can be found, both at home and abroad, who can defend slavery from the Bible, and who have no scruples against living among a slave-holding population. But churches, like schools, cannot exist where the people are too widely scattered to furnish supporting congregations. And though Northern farmers may go several miles to church or Sunday school, this obstacle is almost morally insuperable to an indolent people, dwelling in a warm climate, where the roads are impassable in winter, and in the summer exertion is the burden of life.

We should, however, discriminate between that moral obliquity which seems to be consistent with pro-slavery Christianity, and that moral and religious blindness which results from want of Christian teaching. The former, so forcibly illustrated in the conduct of the Christian leaders of the Rebellion, undoubtedly was mainly caused by slavery; while the latter has no more necessary connection with it than the heathenism of the Ashantee prince has with his participation in the slave-trade.*

In addition to these effects upon intellectual and religious education of an exclusive devotion to agriculture, we must

* The inferiority in education and positive morality of the inhabitants of rural districts is ably discussed in an essay on "Rural Life," by Dr. Holland (*Lessons in Life*, p. 162). See also Kay's "Social Condition of the English People," which but confirms the opinion of all travellers, that the English peasant is not only more ignorant, but more immoral, than the inhabitants of manufacturing towns. Also Hume's "Essay on Agriculture"; Buckle's "History of Civilization," Vol. I. p. 273 and note 86, Amer. ed.; Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations," Book III. Chap. 4.

consider its effect upon the third condition of democratic institutions, the general division of property in land. And in regard to this, it appears that all purely agricultural countries naturally tend from such a distribution, and to the accumulation of landed property in the hands of a few.

Estates grow by accretion. The rich man is able to tide over a bad harvest, and buys in the land which his poor neighbor, barely able to support himself in ordinary times, is obliged to sell at a great sacrifice. The most notable instance of this is recorded in the forty-seventh chapter of Genesis, where, during the famine in Egypt, Pharaoh bought up all the land of the kingdom. Illustrations of this gravitation of property to the hands of the wealthy may be gathered from every quarter of the earth, and from the history of almost every nation. Buckle, in his "*History of Civilization*," traces the process in a few nations, Egypt, ancient Mexico, India, and Peru, showing why the principle is especially true of countries lying in warm latitudes. John Stuart Mill thus speaks of Rome: "When inequality of wealth once commences, in a community not constantly engaged in repairing by industry the injuries of fortune, its advances are gigantic; the great masses swallow up the smaller. The Roman Empire ultimately became covered with the vast landed possessions of a comparatively few families, for whose luxury, and still more for whose ostentation, the most costly products were raised, while the cultivators of the soil were slaves, or small tenants in a nearly servile condition. From this time the wealth of the empire progressively declined."* At this point in the history of Rome, the vast tribute exacted from conquered nations, together with the toil of their ancestors in overcoming the obstacles of nature, had effected for the inhabitants of Rome what a bounteous nature had done for their southern provinces, as for our Southern States, in creating a state of affairs in which the bare necessities of life could be obtained with almost no labor.

In a cold climate, among a commercial and manufacturing people, such concentration of property in families is impossible, unless produced by laws or customs of primogeniture, or other

* *Political Economy*, Vol. I. p. 36, Amer. ed.

abnormal means. In the North, we find that the great estates held a hundred years ago by the patroons, or grantees of patents, have mostly dwindled away to the size of ordinary farms.

The fluctuations and contingencies of trade, or even the natural division among children, equalizes property ; so that the descendants of wealthy men, in the third or fourth generation, are rarely by inheritance in affluent circumstances. In addition to this process of levelling down the rich, which is true in a smaller degree of agricultural countries, there is the more powerful equalizing process, among a manufacturing or commercial people, of elevating the poor. These departments of industry open a field for the display of mechanical or business talents such as agricultural pursuits never afford. The operative in the factory often makes a valuable mechanical or scientific discovery, and becomes rich by his invention ; and the office boy, beginning life by sweeping out the counting-room or store, often rises, through the successive grades of clerkships, to an equality with his employer. And in this each is aided by the education of the school rendered possible by the towns which these branches of industry establish.

But the peasant or poor white tilling the ground has no such opportunities as this ; his fate is fixed ; he dies as he has lived, fortunate if a kind Heaven permits his dust to mingle with that of his fathers in the soil which he trod when living. When the cultivator of the soil lives near a market, like a great city, there is a field for the exercise of certain talents, in raising vegetables, fruits, and flowers for sale, and so far an opportunity for him to rise. But in a country with so few towns as the South, even this narrow field is wanting.

In addition to these considerations, general in their nature, is the special fact applicable to the South, that her great staples afford a peculiar advantage to capital. They require extensive and valuable machinery in their preparation for market, which the poor cultivator cannot purchase. And, moreover, a large force of labor is required, but only during a short season of the year. This the small cultivator cannot hire from others like himself, since all need it at the same time ; nor without capital can he support dependants, whether slaves or hired laborers,

to supply this labor. Thus by both these means the competition of the poor with the rich is prevented, and the large landholder stands ever ready to buy in the land which a discouraged or necessitous small proprietor may offer for sale.

We thus see why political power has remained so long in the hands of certain families in the South, when we consider the obstacles to be encountered by those endeavoring to rise from the lower classes of society.

Such are some of the effects upon society of an exclusive devotion to agriculture. Tried by the three conditions first laid down, — general education, religious training, and division of property in land, — we have seen that the South was wanting. The result of this — ignorance, debasement, impoverishment of the masses, and a monopoly of wealth and power in the hands of a few — is a virtual aristocracy.

There still remains the consideration of one other cause of this aristocratic tendency of the South. Those already enumerated may be regarded as the more or less indirect effects of climate; indirect, because affecting the people through the pursuits which the climate forces upon them. In addition to this is the direct influence of the temperature of the atmosphere upon individuals. The consequences of this, because more apparent, are better understood and more universally acknowledged than the former, and only need mention to present more fully the power of the forces which impel the South to an aristocracy.

This direct effect of climate is discussed at length by Montesquieu,* by Hume, Buckle, J. S. Mill,† &c. A warm climate makes men indolent; “energy at the call of passion they possess in abundance, but not that which is manifested in sustained and persevering labor.”‡ With this indolence comes pride,§ and contempt for those who labor. And sluggishness of body is rarely united with that activity of mind which, taking cognizance of all the bearings of a subject, and looking far into the future, forms or guards good political institutions. Still more

* *Spirit of Laws*, Book XIV.

† *Political Economy*, Book I. Chap. 7, § 3.

‡ J. S. Mill.

§ Montesquieu, *Book XIX*. Chap. 9.

rarely is it joined to that self-restraint, willingness to sacrifice the present to the future, and eternal vigilance, which are the price of liberty.

Thus all nations inhabiting a warm climate tend naturally to servitude under foreign or domestic masters, whatever may be their pursuits.

We thus find, that, however other causes may have quickened or intensified the process, climatic influences are alone sufficient to produce an aristocratic tendency in the South, and a disinclination or unfitness for free, popular institutions. And when we consider the history of the early Colonies, remarking that there was a preponderance of Tories in South Carolina during the Revolution,* and that Massachusetts sent more soldiers to fight Southern battles in that war than all the Southern Colonies,† and remember that at this time all held slaves, we shall be less inclined to attribute Southern unfitness or want of love for popular institutions to transient or accidental causes.

It is hardly necessary to add anything upon the democratic tendencies of the North, since these are sufficiently obvious, resulting in a great measure from influences just the reverse of those operating upon the South.

We have thus endeavored to account for the growth of the aristocracy in the South, and the consequent social divergence of the two sections, which is assigned by many as the immediate cause of Secession.

Regarding their antagonistic interests, the cause assigned by so many others, but little need be added. We have shown the influence of the climate in making the Southerners an agricultural people; and as such, perfect free trade seemed to almost the whole population (except the sugar producers of Louisiana) a necessity of their well-being. Whether this opinion was correct or not we need not consider; it was their opinion, and probably will be that of every agricultural people to the end of time. And whether true or false, the belief would produce the same course of conduct as the fact. The power of this opin-

* Life of Marion, cited by F. L. Olmsted, "Seaboard Slave States," p. 503.

† Hildreth's History of the United States, Vol. IV. p 208.

ion of interest is seen in the relation of the West to Secession. The soil and climate devoted the West, as the South, to agriculture ; and only by skilful management, as many believe, were several of the Western States prevented from joining the Secession movement. So strong was interest in producing Secession.

As the South were advocates of free trade, so the Middle and Eastern States mostly supported a tariff. And the soundness of their views, as in the case of the South, has no connection with the argument. Thus climatic influences produced the antagonism of interests, as well as the social divergence of the sections.

We spoke at the outset of the prominence and power at the South of the doctrine of State rights, which is sometimes assigned as the cause of Secession, saying that, admitting its influence, some explanation of its presence is required. Yet little need be said upon the subject. Given a divergence of institutions and an antagonism of interests, with a people uneducated to self-restraint, incapable of looking into the future, apt from their ignorance to magnify the disadvantages and under-estimate the benefits of a union, and some theory could easily be found to justify a separation. This the doctrine of State sovereignty afforded ; harmless as a mere theory, it became powerful for evil only from the causes which we have shown above resulted from climatic influences. Such have been the effects of climate in the past, such they will be in the future, unless resisted by moral forces powerful enough to restrain them ; for Nature's laws are uniform, constant, and implacable.

If climate, and not accidental causes, created the present aristocracy in the South, or was alone sufficiently powerful to have created it in a longer time, under the same conditions it will raise up another, though the whole existing population be exterminated and the land parcelled out among Northern soldiers. If climate is alone sufficient to make the poor whites such as now they are, — ignorant, irreligious, and impoverished, — it would degrade to their level even the transplanted yeomanry of New England. If climate devoted the South to agriculture, and so made her an advocate of free trade, it will still oppose manufactures, and make her a more bitter opponent of a tariff. And

lastly, if Secession and civil war were, as most thinking men believe, the legitimate results of this natural divergence of institutions and antagonism of interests, if these are not arrested, what must the future bear but wars, since the laws of Nature are invariable?

The discussion of the influence of climate has been thus far extended, in order to show more fully than is generally attempted the nature and difficulty of the problem presented to our people for solution. Its importance is sufficiently apprehended, as the almost universal desire for the legal abolition of slavery proves. The Constitutional amendment has been so generally favored, because men felt that slavery was the discordant element, the removal of which would secure future stability. But if the arguments here presented are valid, the delusiveness of this expectation will be readily seen. If slavery does not produce the exclusive devotion of the South to agriculture which makes her an advocate of free trade, its removal will not wean her from it. And if an aristocracy would arise in the South in the absence of the negro element, the abolition of slavery will not remove the opposition to popular institutions and contempt of labor, which inhere in aristocracy. Moreover, the brutality, licentiousness, and disregard of personal rights which accompany negro slavery, and which we regard rather as foul excrescences upon the Southern oligarchy than as vital elements of its hostility to the Union, — even these will hardly be removed by the Constitutional amendment prohibiting slavery. For this long train of evils, which excites the indignation and evokes the protest of philanthropists, leading, as some maintain, to the late civil war, springs from man's irresponsible power over man, call it by what name we will, — slavery, peonage, or serfdom. Leave now the freed but proscribed blacks to the almost illimitable power of State legislation, and what may we expect? The negro may be sold into apprenticeship, or may be prohibited from the witness-stand, and then the employer has an irresponsible power over the employed. The word "slavery," in the Amendment, is too indefinite a term, and is little aided by its adjunct, "involuntary servitude"; if the slavery agitation caused the late Rebellion, the mere construction of these words would be sufficient to create another.

We often hear it said, that the mere suppression of the Rebellion will be sufficient to prevent its repetition ; but this assertion all history falsifies. If the causes which produced it still retain their vigor, wars and victories, confiscations, and execution of the leaders, will be but palliatives, temporary expedients, no more effectual to prevent future rebellions than they were in England against the Stuarts, or than they have been in Ireland, or in Poland. If now a remedy can be found to heal this division between the sections, there must be no delay in its application ; it must be used while the horrors of war are fresh in the minds of the people, and while the late aristocracy of the South is powerless. Since the South tends to an aristocracy ; since all the large estates will not be confiscated, thus leaving some rich men ; and since Northern settlers will rapidly acquire large fortunes, and become, as heretofore, the most intense Southerners, — this new-born aristocracy, supported again by a party in the North, as in the nature of things it will be, soon will acquire too great a power to permit any of those changes which now are possible. Time heals many diseases in the body politic ; but, as we learned from slavery, some it only aggravates.

We cannot permit Secession ; for the same Nature which has established these causes of discord and disunion has, by the stern decrees of geographical configuration, marked out this country for one people and one government. If, on the one hand, she seems to compel separation, on the other she commands union. But climate we cannot change. What, then, can be done ? Are we thus the children of fate, the playthings of the elements ? It cannot be. There must be some reconciliation between these decrees of Nature, if we can only find it.

We are taught every day, that, though man cannot destroy, he can direct natural forces ; and if civilization and science are of any value, it is in teaching how to subdue Nature's laws, and make them servants instead of masters. "If," as says Emerson, "fate is so prevailing, man also is part of it, and can control fate with fate."

We have seen that the chief denationalizing effect of climate in this country is in rendering the South wholly agricultural, since this tends to aristocracy and free trade. The

obvious remedy is the general establishment of manufactures, which, as already shown, are democratic in their influence. The problem is, How can this be effected?

Many attempts were made, in the years preceding the war, to establish various manufactures in the South, most of which were unsuccessful. An examination of the causes of their failure will show the prospect of future success, and the assistance needed for that object.

In the first place, the failure was not due to the want of natural advantages. That "great free soil wedge," the Alleghany range, extending through Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee, into Alabama and Georgia, itself larger than all Great Britain, contains inexhaustible stores of coal, iron, salt, limestone, &c., with water-power enough to turn the machinery of the world. And, in fact, abundant supplies of iron and coal are found in most of the Southern States, and water-power is equally abundant. In addition to these are copper, lead, zinc, marble, &c.; while cotton, the great staple, is at their door.

Nor can we attribute the failure to difficulty in obtaining labor. The factories which have been successfully established have experienced no such obstacle. It was the common testimony of Southern manufacturers, that three times as much labor was offered, unskilled to be sure, as could be employed.

Nor was it due to the necessary unprofitableness of the investment. When manufactures gained a foothold, as they sometimes did, they were largely profitable.

Having considered what were not the obstacles to the manufacturing interest of the South, we are prepared to treat of those which did exist. In the first place, those enumerated as opposing their establishment in Colonial times operated, though to a modified extent. In addition to these was public opinion. Perhaps Jefferson was mainly instrumental in fostering this by his condemnation of the manufacturing classes in his Notes on Virginia.* For although more extended observation caused a radical change of his opinions,† these new views never gained publicity. Manufactures were felt to be opposed to the institutions of the South; a South Carolina paper called mechanics

* Query 19.

† See Randall's Life of Jefferson, Vol. III. pp. 428 - 438.

“pests to society, dangerous among the slave population.”* This opposition in many cases exhibited itself in the destruction of factories erected by Northern capital, of which the ruins seen by our army on the Peninsula — one on the James River above Newport News, and another near Lee’s Mills — are illustrations. But the educated men in the South, even before this war, comparing their material poverty with the wealth of New England, began to see that manufactures were absolutely necessary to their existence. The fallacy that a people could prosper, even in a material point of view, by exclusive devotion to agriculture, was by actual sad experiment finally exploded. So we find a Governor of Virginia earnestly advocating and recommending the introduction of manufactures. The result of this war, introducing a new element of population, will probably quench the last sparks of this opposition of public opinion. But this obstacle probably never operated to any considerable extent, save in the rural districts, among the more ignorant classes of society. In the cities, where the semblance of law and order was more efficiently maintained, the failure may be traced mainly to one cause alone; the same which, in the opinions of the old Whig party, ruined so often this branch of Northern industry, — *competition* and custom.

It would be unnecessary to dilate upon this subject, were it not a matter so little understood by one class of our political economists, and never applied at home by another. Those who believe that capital will necessarily flow to the place where the largest profits can be earned, will probably also hold that purchasers always buy the cheapest goods, if not of inferior quality. Hence, if cotton goods could have been sold for less by Southern manufacturers than by Northern, they would have found purchasers enough. Space is not afforded to refute either of these fallacies; but the upholders of the first may be referred to one advocate of free trade, Adam Smith; † and another free-trader can answer the second class.‡ But to students of the subject it is only necessary to show how these admitted

* Olmsted’s Seaboard Slave States, p. 512.

† See Wealth of Nations, Book IV. Chap. 2.

‡ J. S. Mill’s Political Economy, Vol. I. Book II. Chap. 4, § 3.

influences affected the South. The absence of a tariff ruined them by an inundation of English goods ; its presence crushed them no less by the fabrics of New England. The mode of accounting for the latter fact must necessarily be by an enumeration of some of the arguments used so feelingly by Northern manufacturers for explaining England's power over our markets, under a non-protective system. First, preponderance of capital. The greater the capital employed up to a certain point, the more cheaply, of course, manufactured goods can be produced and sold. From this the South suffered, and yet could, as we have seen, with small capital, have succeeded but for the other power which capital affords, that of underselling for a time, at an absolute loss to the underseller, in order to run off competition. In 1815, Henry Brougham, now Lord Brougham, understanding fully England's commercial policy, declared in Parliament, that "England could afford to incur some loss on the export of English goods, for the purpose of destroying foreign manufactures in their cradle." And the London Times stated that the combination, during three or four years, for this purpose, cost between one and a half and two million dollars. And as England has treated the North, so New England has treated the South. The history of one town in South Carolina will illustrate this, as also the beneficial effects of the establishment of manufactories. In the village of Graniteville, near Charleston, S. C., about one thousand persons were before the war gathered together by one cotton-mill ; some working as factory hands, others raising produce for their support. The company supported day and Sunday schools for the children. This mill bought yearly four thousand bales of cotton, and sold four million yards of cloth, better than English or Northern goods. But for several years the owners sold their goods at or under cost of manufacture, in order to get them into market ; and having a large capital, were finally successful.

Another reason for the power of the North over the Southern market was priority of establishment of manufactures. Mill says : "The superiority of one country over another in a branch of production often arises only from having begun it sooner. There may be no inherent advantage on one part, or disadvantage on the other, but only a present superiority of acquired

skill and experience.”* This superiority was shown, in the case of the South, in two ways. First, by absence of skilled labor. The production of a body of skilled artisans is a work of long time and favorable circumstances. For want of them, England could not compete with the Netherlands or France till the atrocities of Philip and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes drove the workmen to her shores whom she herself could not produce. For fine work, a few operatives imported into a country might suffice to teach a people, already accustomed to manufactures, the secrets of their art; but in the South is needed a whole manufacturing population, which must be raised at home, the number required being too large for importation. The second effect of this prior establishment of manufactures in the North is occupation of the market, — an advantage not generally noticed by political economists, yet one whose influence is daily seen. Persons accustomed to purchase goods at one place for years change with reluctance. When used to goods of a certain brand, they distrust even a better article with another stamp; and, in fact, in most branches of business the age of an establishment is a presumption for or against the article presented, often too strong to be overthrown by evidence. Some people purchase many articles of foreign manufacture, although as good a home production is offered at a smaller price. So our wine-merchants send a mixture to France, which reimported sells for champagne. The proof of the influence of this in the South is the fact, that often, before the war, Southern manufactured goods were sent to New York to be reshipped to the South for sale, under the name of Northern fabrics. Southern goods would not sell, because not known. And in fact, the products of a few Southern mills formed so small a part of the stock which a merchant would buy in the fall, that, in the absence of a large Southern city like New York, where he could lay in his stock, it was cheaper for him to buy all together in one place, than to expend time and money by hunting up and purchasing a few cotton goods at Southern factories.

Thus we find that the first obstacle was public opinion, the fear of danger to their institutions, though we see this giving

* Political Economy, Vol. II. Book V. Chap. 10, § 1.

way under the greater dread of poverty ; while still stronger than this was the influence of the well-settled, long-established manufactories of the North,—a power explicable by reason, and acknowledged by the authority of free-traders and protectionists alike.

This war has accomplished much in changing the public opinion of the South, and in establishing manufactures there of various kinds. Yet few of these, from want of capital, can be more than temporary furnishers of goods formerly supplied by the North. The North, in its preparation for the newly opened “Southern trade,” evidently expects the old *régime*. Another result of the war, hopeful for the future, is the liberation of capital (a phrase not strictly correct, but enough so for our purpose) in the North, which perhaps will flow into the South for investment. The rich man who would invest a few millions in South Carolina cotton-factories would soon find it a profitable enterprise, and thereby more would be done to cement the Union than by any compromise or political concession. The pressure of the national debt will probably sustain a tariff, and in a measure prevent the foreign competition which so often has injured the South. But it is very improbable that any or all of these combined will be sufficient support against the greatly strengthened Northern manufactures. The North, after two hundred years, still complains, that, unaided, it cannot compete with England. Can Southern mills of four years’ growth compete with us ? But unless in some way they are enabled to establish this counteracting force against aristocracy, its growth appears inevitable. The framers of the Constitution, as if almost foreseeing this necessity, wisely made provision for such a case. Instead of saying that Congress alone should have power to lay imposts, which should be uniform, or using some other form of words which would require an amendment to permit a State tariff against another State, they provided by Section 10, Article I. : “No State shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports,” &c. This permission of course Congress can give, if it seems advisable ; the sums collected going into the treasury of the United States, as provided by the same section. On this subject, John Stuart Mill, an advocate of free trade, says :

“ The only case in which, on mere principles of political economy, protecting duties can be defensible, is when they are imposed temporarily (especially in a young and rising nation), in hopes of naturalizing a foreign industry, in itself perfectly suitable to the circumstances of the country. The superiority of one country over another in a branch of production often arises only from having begun it sooner. There may be no inherent advantage on one part, or disadvantage on the other, but only a present superiority of acquired skill and experience. But it cannot be expected that individuals should at their own risk, or rather to their certain loss, introduce a new manufacture, and bear the burden of carrying it on, until the producers have been educated up to the level of those with whom the processes are traditional. A protecting duty, continued for a reasonable time, will sometimes be the least inconvenient mode in which the nation can tax itself for the support of such an experiment.” *

We at the North have urged these arguments for ourselves these many years ; are we now willing to apply them to the South ? We have long shown to the South philanthropy to be both a common and an easy virtue ; are we willing to exhibit wisdom and justice which are neither common nor easy ? If, by some protective laws in favor of the South, easily framed and easily executed, we can establish manufactures there, one great cause of dissension will be removed ; the tariff no longer directly or indirectly will threaten the Union.

So much political economy teaches of the mode of reconciling the conflicting interests of North and South ; yet this alone will not suffice. The growth of manufactures must necessarily be slow, and their influence will be but gradually felt ; while the agricultural power, at first supreme, always will be paramount. Without manufactures the preservation of democratic principles appears impossible, the growth of aristocratic ones inevitable. With manufactures their perpetuation seems hopeful ; yet it is a contest against soil and climate, in which freedom needs every possible assistance. In a country whose natural tendency to aristocracy is such as has been pointed out,

* Political Economy, Vol. II. Book V. Chap. 10, § 1.

what danger may not be apprehended from the presence of a Pariah caste, whose debasement and incapacity for self-protection invites to their subjection! In the North there is always a division into classes, rich and poor, learned and ignorant, high and low, but they are never permanent. They are like the sea and the clouds: the drop which stagnates among the weeds to-day, to-morrow may reflect the hues of the rainbow.

The constant interchange of position, preventing settled castes and class spirit, is our safety. But when in a state, especially one of aristocratic tendencies, there is a caste distinction drawn, permanent and unchangeable, because based upon Nature's brand, setting off a race proscribed, ignorant, and necessitous, there a weight is thrown into the scale on the side of aristocracy which it seems impossible to counterbalance. That this is not an imaginary danger is shown by the example of Jamaica. Says Mr. Underhill: "Only the perpetual interposition of the British government has prevented the enfranchised negro from being reduced to the condition of a serf, by the selfish partisan legislation of the Jamaica planters."* We must remember that the Southern States, when once reorganized, will have the power to legislate as iniquitously as did the planters of Jamaica, with no superior Parliament to revise their actions. That conscientious scruples, or considerations of interest, would restrain such legislation, the sad experience of the past hardly gives us ground to hope. Already we see in the South, wherever the military power is withdrawn, the incipient steps of a policy bearing more severely upon the negro than even the condition of nominal slavery, since his physical situation is more pitiable, while his mind is only deluded by the phantom of liberty. We can hardly hope that the influx of Northerners will be a counteracting force, when we consider the class of men, mostly adventurers and speculators, who will form this immigrating population, and remember that transplanted Northerners have always been the most bitter opponents of their native section, and the most firmly wedded to the institutions of the South. Overruling the decision in the "Dred Scot case," or allowing

* "The West Indies, their Social and Religious Condition," by Edward B. Underhill, p. 222; quoted by Professor Cairnes, "The Slave Power," p. 167.

that decision to stand, and exercising the power granted to Congress by the Constitution, "to establish an uniform rule of naturalization," and thus making the freedmen citizens, would mitigate the evil to a slight extent; yet a terrible power would still be reserved to the States, sufficient, as has been already said, to produce all the evils attending nominal slavery in the past.

But arm this class with the weapon of the free citizen, as silent and more powerful than the billet of a Borgia, and at once all this is changed. He now will be courted, where before he was spurned; interest more potent than philanthropy will now dictate education, where before it demanded debasement; the Pariah will now be treated with outward respect, and the caste barrier be swept away. Without the ballot, four million blacks, increasing more rapidly than the whites, may not only serve as the basis for another aristocracy, fatal to the Union, but also, in the future, bring upon the South the horrors of the war between races so vividly predicted by De Tocqueville.

As has been shown already, if this check upon aristocracy is to be applied at all, it must be done at once, before the new aristocracy acquires the power to successfully oppose it.

We are told that the negro is now unfit for the ballot, because of his ignorance and degradation. And men using this argument would have us fold our arms and wait for his elevation; just as our fathers waited for the abolition of slavery, which they hoped would come some day, they knew not when or how. We have seen how it came. As matters now stand, the negro can never be better fitted for the rights of citizenship, since every interest in the South unites for his depression. Each hour's delay increases the evil, while diminishing the possibility of its correction.

If an amendment to the Constitution could be passed, regulating the status and rights of the negro, in order to secure the end suggested in this paper, it need not confer upon the illiterate black the right of immediate suffrage. We might learn a lesson from the framers of the Constitution, and provide that, after a term of years, no distinction should be made because of color; in the mean time giving the ballot to those who can read and write. The knowledge that in say twenty years

this addition would be made to their voting population would make it for the immediate interest of the South to educate her future voters. But the passage of such an amendment is hardly possible. The one abolishing slavery has not yet been ratified; and, unless ratified, there is, according to the *theory* of President Johnson, nothing to prevent the re-establishment of even nominal slavery by the reorganized States. Public opinion at the North would not be ready for another amendment until it would be too late.

The only feasible method of accomplishing this vital result seems to be by the action of Congress. The Supreme Court, the tribunal of last peaceable resort, has decided that the conflict of the last four years has been a *war*, — that the South have been belligerents. Being such, their States now, by virtue of our victory, occupy the position of conquered territory, over which Congress has legislative control. And as the ordinance for the government of the Northwestern Territory was effectual to exclude slavery from the Northwestern States, so Congress might pass an ordinance fixing the status of the negro in the South, and would have the power to make this ordinance effectual.

But we do not desire to consider further the means by which this restraint upon the aristocratic tendency of the South may be secured; we only wish to show its necessity. If this can be made apparent, the mode of its application can be easily settled.

These, then, seem to be two indispensable conditions of the preservation of democratic ideas in the South, and the perpetuity of the Union, — suffrage to the negro, and permission to the Southern States to protect their manufactures till they shall be able to compete with the North. Alone neither can be sufficient; together, the successful result is by no means certain, but it may be hoped for.